

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
5 Assistant United States Attorney

6 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
7 San Jose, California 95113
8 Telephone: (408) 535-5056
9 FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

E-FILED - 8/2/06

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 06-00195 RMW
2 Plaintiff,)
3 v.) [] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
4 THUY PHUOC DINH,) FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
a/k/a Pierre Dinh,) CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A)
5 Defendant.) & 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv))
6 _____)
7

8 On July 17, 2006, the parties appeared before the Court for a status hearing. At that
9 appearance, Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight informed the Court that Anne Marie
10 Tomassini, who represents the defendant, has requested to review the physical evidence in the
11 case and the government would need time to obtain the evidence for such a review. The
12 evidence is currently in the custody of the Drug Enforcement Administration in Philadelphia.
13 The parties then requested that the case be continued to August 28, 2006. The parties also
14 requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from July 17, 2006 until August 28,
15 2006 in order for the government to obtain the evidence from the DEA in Philadelphia and to
16 afford Ms. Tomassini adequate time to review it. The defendant, through Ms. Tomassini, agreed
17 to the exclusion. The parties stipulated and agreed that an exclusion under the Speedy
18 Trial Act was appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

19 SO STIPULATED.

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

20 DATED: _____

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

23 DATED: _____

/s/
ANNE MARIE TOMASSINI
Counsel for Mr. Pierre Dinh

26 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between July 17, 2006 until
27 August 28, 2006 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act. The Court finds that the failure to grant
28 the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel. The Court

finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

8/2/06
Dated

/s/ Ronald M. Whyte
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge